



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,645	04/15/2004	Chad Vos	1160215/0431069	8422
26874	7590	10/05/2007		
FROST BROWN TODD, LLC 2200 PNC CENTER 201 E. FIFTH STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			EXAMINER HASHEM, LISA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dbell@fbtlaw.com
rgaunce@fbtlaw.com
aulmer@fbtlaw.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/825,645

Applicant(s)

VOS ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa Hashem

Art Unit

2614

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lisa Hashem (PTO personnel).

(3)_____.

(2) William Morriss (applicant's representative).

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: US PG PUB 2002/0106070 by Elsey et al, hereinafter Elsey.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Lisa Hashem

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative argued that Elsey does not teach: 'a global knowledge database including responses to user inquiries' as recited in claim 1, 'a second response system comprises an automated response system' as recited in claim 4, and 'generating an overlaid contact graph' as recited in claim 15. Examiner disagrees. Examiner has interpreted database server (Fig. 1, 26) as the global knowledge database. A customer calls into a call center and inquires about services, for example, a restaurant listing, and an operator or first response system (Fig. 1: 18, 20) searches the database server for the response to the inquiry (section 0028-0032). Elsey teaches a VRU (Fig. 1, 30) as the second response system that is an automated response system that connects a customer to a destination number of an inquiry (i.e. restaurant listing) and if the call is not answered, provides the customer with menu options related to the call (i.e. leave a message for the non-answering party, call back in N minutes). The operator retrieves the destination telephone number from the database server and provides that information to the VRU in order for the VRU to initiate the phone call. Thus, the VRU uses information from the database server to initiate the call via the operator (section 0028-0034).

Elsey teaches a summary of events in a table and this reads on the 'overlaid contact graph'. Examiner suggested the limitations in claim 15 be modified to represent the graph shown in Fig. 5 of the instant application by using descriptive language to read away from the table cited in Elsey (section 0039-0049).

Applicant proposed an amendment to claim 1 including '...wherein said plurality of responses comprises a transcript for responding to an inquiry...'. Examiner noted how the claim should be amended to 'each response of said plurality of responses comprises a transcript' to show how each response has its own transcript rather than a plurality of responses having the same transcript. Also, the use of the word transcript may create a 112 rejection because it is not clear what transcript means in the claim and the specification does not have sufficient information to define what transcript means in the instant application.

Applicant's representative noted that the limitations in claim 1 '...a first response system configured to provide a second response to a second user inquiry...' should be amended to '...a second response system configured to provide a second response to a second user inquiry...'. This will change the interpretation of the claim.

FROST BROWN TODD LLCCINCINNATI, OHIO
FAX COVER SHEET**Facsimile Transmission****Date and time of transmission:** Tuesday, September 18, 2007 1:57:34 PM**Number of pages:** 04 (Including this cover page.)Name Lisa Hashem
Company US Patent & Trademark Office
Location Alexandria, VAFax Number 915712737542
Voice Number 571 272-7542Name William S. Morriss
Fax Number
Voice Number 513 651-6915**COMMENTS**Please review enclosed Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form
with attachments.

THIS FAX IS CONFIDENTIAL AND IS FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IT MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, ATTORNEYS' WORK PRODUCT AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT (OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT), ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY COLLECT TELEPHONE.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THE IRS, WE INFORM YOU THAT ANY TAX ADVICE CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION (INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS) WAS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF (I) AVOIDING PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OR (II) PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING TO ANOTHER PARTY ANY TRANSACTION OR MATTER ADDRESSED HEREIN.

CINCINNATI FAX NUMBER: (513) 651-6981**OTHER OFFICES (FAX NUMBERS)**LOUISVILLE (502) 581-1087
COLUMBUS (614) 464-1737
LEXINGTON (859) 231-0011
MIDDLETOWN (513) 422-3010
NASHVILLE (615) 251-5551
NEW ALBANY (812) 948-7994SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS TRANSMISSION,
PLEASE CALL (513) 651-6775

PTOL-413A (07-07)

Approved for use through 09/30/2007. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/825,645 First Named Applicant: Chad Vos, et al.
 Examiner: Lisa Hashem Art Unit: 2614 Status of Application: Non-final rejection

Tentative Participants:

(1) Lisa Hashem (2) William S. Morriss
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 9/20/07 Proposed Time: 11:30 **(AM/PM)**

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1 - 17</u>	<u>E. Elsey</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See summary sheet attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

William S. Morriss
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

 Examiner/SPE Signature

William S. Morriss

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

60,477

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Summary of Topics to Be Discussed During the Interview of 9/20/07:

- 1) Elsey does not teach a global knowledge database including responses to user inquiries as is recited in claim 1. Instead, paragraph 32 of Elsey (cited as teaching the global knowledge database in the rejection of claim 1) teaches a searchable database which includes information such as movie listings and directions to various locations. While such a searchable database of information may be useful, it is not a database of responses to inquiries, as is recited in claim 1.
- 2) Elsey does not teach an automated response system in communication with a global knowledge database. In the pending claims, claim 1 recites that a second response system is in communication with a global knowledge database. Claims 4 and 10 (both of which depend indirectly from claim 1) recite that the second response system is an automated response system. Paragraphs 31 and 33 of Elsey, cited against claims 4 and 10, disclose a voice response unit (VRU) which can provide a menu of options to a caller. However, even if such a VRU is considered an automated response system, there is no teaching or suggestion that the menu of options comes from a global knowledge database. Thus, even if the VRU of Elsey is an automated response system, its disclosure still does not anticipate claims 4 or 10.
- 3) Elsey does not teach or suggest generating an overlaid contact graph, as is recited in claim 15. As shown in figure 5 and paragraphs 20-23 of the application as originally filed, an overlaid contact graph is a method for presenting information to a human in visual form. The disclosure from Elsey cited against claim 15, ¶¶39-49, teaches techniques for transmitting data between automated systems (e.g., ¶ 39, discussing compression and data translation techniques; ¶ 47, discussing prioritizing transmission of records to maximize bandwidth). Accordingly, Elsey does not anticipate claim 15.
- 4) For the purpose of discussion only, the applicants have presented a potential amendment to claim 1 which is believed to clearly distinguish that claim from Elsey. The applicants would appreciate if the Examiner could provide an opinion as to whether that amendment would effectively distinguish claim 1 from the art of record, and if the Examiner could identify any other areas of patentable subject matter disclosed in the application which, if explicitly recited in the claims, would distinguish the claims from the art of record.

Proposed Amendment

1. A system for processing user inquiries, the system comprising:

a global knowledge database including a plurality of responses corresponding to a plurality of user inquiries, wherein said plurality of responses comprises a transcript for responding to an inquiry;

a first response system in communication with the global knowledge database, the first response system configured to provide a first response to a first user inquiry using a response included in the global knowledge database, the first response system being of a first type of response system;

a second response system in communication with the global knowledge database, the first response system configured to provide a second response to a second user inquiry using a response included in the global knowledge database, the second response system being of a second type of response system;

an analysis database configured to store indications of responses provided by the first response system and the second response system; and

a report generator configured to generate a report using the stored indications of the response provided by the first response system and the second response system.